

APPLICANTS: ILAN, Gabriel et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/674,710
FILED: January 29, 2000
Page 2

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 8-19 and 21-33 are pending in the application and have been rejected.

The Telephone Interview

Initially, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner, Yonel Beaulieu for granting and attending the telephone interview, with Applicants' Representative, Heidi M. Brun, Reg. No. 34,504 on May 12, 2004. In the interview, claims 25 and 33 were discussed. Applicants presented arguments traversing the Examiner's Response to Arguments on page 2, line 1 - page 3, line 6 of the Office Action. In view of these arguments, the Examiner pointed out that the Garthwaite et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,124,826) reference no longer reads on these claims. The Examiner also noted that an update search may be made.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8-15, 17, 19, 21-27, 29 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Garthwaite et al. (US Patent 6,124,826).

As argued in the Interview, Garthwaite's items 3 and 5 may be two different inputs to the control unit integrated in item 2. However, Garthwaite et al. describes them in operation either for handwriting input or for voice input but never for both types of inputs at the same time.

Garthwaite et al. states:

APPLICANTS: ILAN, Gabriel et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/674,710
FILED: January 29, 2000
Page 3

"To input the target position, in particular, the communication unit 2 is connected to an input unit 3. Input is carried out, for example with a keyboard." (col. 3, lines 33 – 35)

"To display routing tips, in particular, the communication unit 2 is further equipped with an output unit 5, which has an optical display for directional tips in the form of symbolic arrows and, as applicable, other written information." (col. 3, lines 38 – 42)

"In further development of the invention, the output unit 5 is also embodied as the input unit 3. In this embodiment of the navigation device, the target position is input by marking or handwritten input on the display. A special electronic input pen is provided for this purpose, which in itself is known. Alternately, the output unit 5 can be designed for voice output through a loudspeaker, while the input unit 3 can be designed for voice input through a microphone." (Col. 3, lines 51 - 59)

As can be seen, the output unit 5 and input unit 3 can both be used for input. However, Garthwaite et al. describes two embodiments, one in which output unit 5 is for handwriting input (no comment is made about what input unit 3 does) and another embodiment in which output unit 5 is for voice output and input unit 3 is for voice input. Garthwaite et al. never describes units 5 and 3 as being for both types of input **in the same embodiment**. Thus, as the Examiner agreed in the Interview, Garthwaite et al. does not describe

"An apparatus comprising:

a voice recognition unit to output at least one first command from at least one command data set;

a handwriting recognition unit to output at least one second command from said at least one command data set; and

APPLICANTS: ILAN, Gabriel et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/674,710
FILED: January 29, 2000
Page 4

a control unit to receive said at least one first command and at least one second command and to communicate a command signal associated therewith to at least one appliance within a vehicle.”

as recited in claim 25. Nor does Garthwaite et al. describe a method such as that of claim 33:

33. A method comprising:

controlling at least one appliance within a vehicle with at least one signal generated from recognition of voice and handwritten input.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 25 and 33 are allowable. Claims 8 – 15, 17, 19, 21 – 24, 26, 27 and 29 depend from, directly or indirectly, claim 25 and therefore, include all the limitations of that claim. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 8 – 15, 17, 19, 21 – 24, 26, 27 and 29 are likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to independent claims 25 and 33 and to claims 8 – 15, 17, 19, 21 – 24, 26, 27 and 29 dependent thereon.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 16 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Garthwaite as applied to claim 25.

Garthwaite has been discussed above. That discussion, in which the allowability of claims 25 was shown, is applicable here. Claims 16 and 30, dependent from claim 25, are also allowable.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 18, 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Garthwaite as applied to claim 25 and further in view of Obradovich (US 6,282,464)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established.

APPLICANTS: ILAN, Gabriel et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/674,710
FILED: January 29, 2000
Page 5

The combination of Garthwaite and Obradovich does not teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 25, nor does it teach or suggest all the limitations of dependent claims 18, 31 and 32. Garthwaite has been discussed above. That discussion is applicable here. Obradovich does not show "a voice recognition unit" and "a handwriting recognition unit" as recited in claim 25, and therefore cannot cure the deficiencies of Garthwaite et al.. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that this rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Authorization to Charge Deposit Account

The United States Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account 501380 for any fee which is necessary in connection with the filing of this response.

Favorable action on the present amendment and response is courteously solicited.

Dated: May 13, 2004

ALPHAPATENT ASSOCIATES LTD.
P.O.B. 2345
BEIT SHEMESH, ISRAEL 99544
TEL. (US) 516-620-4573
TEL. 011 972 2 999 1035
FAX. 011 972 2 999 7638
dswirsky@alphapatent.com

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel J. Swirsky
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 45,148